

THURSDAY, JANUARY 16, 1896.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have rejected articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

Local, News.—The City and Suburban News Bureau of the United Press and New York Associated Purss is at 21 to 22 and street. All information and documents for public use instantly disseminated to the press of the whole country.

The Bond Issue.

The dissolution of the Bond Syndicate was effected yesterday under conditions so wisely arranged that it was at once accepted as a favorable incident in the progress that is making toward reënforcing the Treasury. In his letter to his associates in the Syndicate Mr. PIERPONT MOR-GAN makes it apparent that the Government had nothing whatever to do with the formation of the Syndicate; that he formed it himself as a precautionary measure of grave importance, and that he suggested to the President that the loan be advertised. adding that if it were he would leave nothing undone to support it and make it a success. It now appears that it was with this knowledge in his possession that the President authorized the issue of the call for bids; and it is open to reasonable doubt if he would have done so without the strong assurance of support conveyed in Mr. Mor-GAN's letter. No one can question that it is this same assurance which makes the loan the success it is to-day.

Another interesting disclosure which Mr. MORGAN makes is that the whole \$200,000,-000 was subscribed in less than four days and that its distribution was evenly shared by the following four classes:

"First—Institutions, banking firms, and others in Europe who were prepared, if necessary, to snip the amount of their participation in gold to this side. adly Broks saymes banks trust companies and private individuals throughout the United States in possession of the actual gold coin who desired to secure tonds, either for investment or as a basis for

ational bank circulation. "Thirdiy - Panks in New York, Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, Cinciunati, and other cities in possession of gold, who, watmout necessarily desiring bonds for in ent, were within; to aid in the movement to sustain the Treasury reserve, and exchange their gold for United States bonds, expecting afterward to sell the same in the market.

Fourthly-Institutions, banking firms, and others, who, without being in possession of the actual gold, were willing and able to obtain that gold, at whatever cost for deposit with the Treasury in payment for wided the movement contemplated could be

This is a very remarkable showing, and is most instructive in its relation to any future loan the Government may make. The least important feature of Mr. Mor-

GAN's letter is the utter confusion and shame in which it leaves the scoundrel PULITZER.

How to Protect Americans in the

There is just one proper way of securing fair treatment for the American citizens who are accused of conspiring with Britishers against the lawful Transvaul Government. Our State Department should address itself directly to President KRUGER through our consular representative at Johannesburg. For several obvious reasons no appeal should have been made to Mr. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN to use the influence of the English Colonial Office on behalf of our fellow countrymen. In the first place, such an appeal was superfluous. In the second place, it was calculated to do Americans more harm than good. In the third place, it involved a slight upon the German Emperor, whom at any hour we may need for an ally. And, finally, it may expose the President to some suspicion of vacillation or insincerity in his attitude toward Great Britain, at the very time when Congress and the country were prepared to sustain him with amazing unanimity.

It should require no argument to prove that the request that Mr. JOSEPH CHAMBER-LAIN would exert his influence, such as it is, on behalf of a rested Americans at Johannesburg, was entirely uncalled for. From the viewpoint of the United States, the Transvaal is for all practical purposes an independent country: for the soie remnant of suzerainty reserved for England by the treaty of 1884, which materially changed the treaty of 1881, was a provision that the British Government should have six months in which to express disapproval of any treaty concluded between the South African Republic and a foreign power. Not only, therefore, was President KRUGER the person to whom alone our State Department should have applied, but the extraordinary clemency shown by him to Jameson and his fellow brigands, caught red-handed in the act of crime, was a guarantee that Americans, if implicated in conspiracy, had nothing but the most equitable treatment to expect. To make assur ance on that point doubly sure, we needed only to pass the admirable resolution introduced by Mr. Morgan in the Senate, a resolution which faithfully reflects the sympathy of all genuine Americans with the brave Boers in their struggle against British violence and greed.

The suggestion that Mr. Joseph Chamber LAIN should act as the champion of Ameri can citizens was not merely an act of supererogation; it was but a left-handed service to our incriminated countrymen. There is no man living who is so justly suspected and detested by the Hollanders as is the present Colonial Secretary, who, while JAMESON'S projected raid was for months a matter of common talk in London, remained conveniently deaf, dumb, and blind. It is not to him, but to the native wisdom and generosity of President KRUGER, that the British marauders owe their escape from the gallows; and nothing could be more preposterous than the notion that a word from CHAMBERLAIN could have any effect at Pretoria save to chill the instinctive magnaninfity of the Hollander executive.

If any outside interposition were not flagrantly superfluous, in view of the leniency exhibited toward rebels in the Transvanl, we should have sought the kind offices of the one European sovereign who showed himself the friend of a weak but valiant republic in its hour of need. One monarch was reach, and 64 policre is whose representative is indeed per-

peror WILLIAM II. His message of congratulation and good will to the triumphant Boers ought to have been instantly echoed by the United States, and so it was by the authentic spokesman of the American people. A word to the Kaiser would have gained for any of our citizens charged with treason at Johannesburg not only a just trial, for of that they were and are assured, but. in all likelihood, a gracious and immediate release. By such a well-aimed appeal we should have benefited the persons whom our Government professes a wish to serve. And we should have borne timely and honest testimony to the cordial sympathy with which the Kniser's high-minded course is universally regarded in this country. The day may come when we shall regret that such testimony was not promptly and officially re-

We sustain the President when he is right; but we leave it to the thick-and-thin upholders of the Administration to defend the blunder committed in requesting Mr. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN to protect Americans n the Transvaal.

The Monroe Doctrine of Cleveland.

A great deal has been said lately about the Monroe doctrine, but one thing of the first importance still remains to be said, at least with sufficient emphasis; and in pointing it out, the relation of the Monroe doc trine to international law may perhaps be made to appear somewhat more clearly than it appears in the official discussions.

President MONROE, in his annual message of Dec. 2, 1823, announcing the negotiations pending with Russia concerning our northwestern boundary, used these words: "In the discussions to which this interest has given rise, and in the arrangements by which they may be terminated, the occasion has been judged proper for asserting, as a principle in which the rights and inerests of the United States are involved, that the tmerican continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers."

In a subsequent part of the same message, referring especially to the new formed republies of South America, he thus returned to this principle, or rather to the principle of this declaration [resistance to the extension of European jurisdiction in this hemispherel, making the special application of the principle which has sometimes been mistaken for the principle itself, or for the Monroe doctrine entire .

"In the wars of the European powers, in matters re lating to themselves, we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparations for our defence. With the movements in this hemisphere we are of necessity more immediately conneered, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightenest and imparttal observers. The political system of the ailfed powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. This difference vernments. And to the defence of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure, and matured by the wisdom of our most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed unexample! felicity, this whole nation is devoted. We own it, therefore, to can-der and to the amicable relations existing be-tween the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered, and shall not interfere. but with the Governments, who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose inde-pendence we have on great consideration and on just principles acknowledged, we could not view any inmost ion for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the inited States

Our policy in regard to Europe, which was dopted at an early stage of the wars which have so ong agitated that quarter of the globe, nevertheless emains the same, which is not to interfere in the ingovernment de fucto as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to rve those relations by a frank, firm, and manis policy; meeting, in all instances, the just claims of every power, submitting to injuries from none. But in regard to these continents, circumstances are eminently and conspicuously different. It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any partion of either continent without en dangering our peace and happiness; nor can any one believe that our Southern brothren [the States of South America]. If left to themselves, would adopt it of their own accord. It is equally impossible, therefore, that we should behold such interposition,

n any form, with indifference." Such is the Monroe doctrine, as defined by President MONROE. It warns European powers, severally and collectively, against intervention in American affairs, in any form, for the purpose of controlling, in any manner, the destiny of the American republies, or of extending the territorial possessions of those powers, or of any of them, in this hemisphere. It is undisguised, unambiguous, unmistakable. It is downright and upright.

The Monroe doctrine, as defined by Secretary OLNEY, in his note to Mr. BAYARD, and by President CLEVELAND, in his annual message, lacks a most important element of the original doctrine.

Expounding his view of the doctrine, the Secretary says what follows:

"It does not justify any attempt on our part to change the established form of government of any American State, or to prevent the people of such State from altering that form according to their own will and pleasure. The rule in question has but a single purpose and object. It is that no European power or combination of European powers shall forcibly de-prive an American country of rights and powers of self-government and of shaping its own political fortunes and destinate."

Referring to the devotion of the people of the United States to the cause of popular self-government, he proceeds: " It is in that view more than in any other that they

believe it not to be tolerated that the political con-trol of an American State shall be forcibly assumed by a European power."

Touching on the fruits of the Monroe doctrine he continues:

" President Polk, in the case of Yucatan and the proposed voluntary transfer of that country to Great Britain or Spain, relied upon the Monroe doctrine, though perimps connecously, when he declared, in a special message to Congress on the subject, that the United States could not consent to any such transfer. He concludes:

"There is, then, a doctrine of American public las vell founded in principle, and abundantly sanctioned by precedent, which entities and requires the United States to treat as an injury to itself the foreible as-sumption by a Furopean power of political control over an American State."

The President, summarizing in his annual message the Secretary's note, presents these points of it among others:

"The general conclusions therein reached and formulated are, in substance, that the traditional and established policy of this Government is firmly op-posed to a forcide increase by any European power of its territorial possessions on this continent; that this dirty is as well founded in principle as it is strongly supported by precedents; that as a consequence, the United States is bound to protest against the enlarge ment of the area of British Guiana in derogation of the rights and against the will of Venezuela."

The italics in these quotations, as in the preceding ones from President Monroe's message, are ours, and are used simply to indicate the difference between the Monroe doctrine, as defined by MONROE, grata at Pretoria, and that is the Em-

CLEVELAND. It will be seen that this difference consists in qualifying the intervention against which the doctrine is levelled, the Monroe destrine of Monrok declaring against intervention in any form, peaceable or forcible, the Monroe doctrine of CLEVELAND declaring against forcible intervention only. As Congress, should it come to assert the Monroe doctrine formally, would have to choose between these two forms of it, their relative merits should now be considered by the press and the public, as well as by Congress.

The decisive consideration in the case arises from the nature and ground of the Monroe doctrine.

Lord Salisbury in his reply to Secretary OLNEY insists that the Monroe doctrine has not received the "general consent of nations." Resistance to aggression seldom receives the consent of the aggressors, yet is never on that account held to be unlawful. Were Lord Salishury threatened by footpads, he infallibly would knock them down, if he could, without asking their consent beforehand or caring for it afterward; and municipal law would justify him. In like manner international law justifies one nation in defending itself against the aggression of another or of a combination of others; and the Monroe doctrine is nothing more than a timely notice to European powers that their intervention in American affairs will be resisted by the United States as a menace to its own security.

The Monroe doctrine is not a principle of the law of nations; nobody has ever claimed that it is. It is an application of the principle of self-preservation, which stands at the head and underlies the body of the law of nations, and the application of which, moreover, every independent nation has the right, under the law of nations, to make on its own responsibility, without appeal or review The right of self-preservation, as recognized

in the international code, is primary, absolute, perfect; and since international law recognizes the right, it cannot condemn the exercise of the right, much less the prudent announcement of a determination to exercise it in a stated contingency. The Monroe doctrine, then, although not a principle of international law, is a case under the first and fundamental principle of international law, to which, accordingly, it conforms, and by which it is sanctioned.

The "general consent of nations" has nothing to do with it; its source is infinitely deeper. The Monroe doctrine springs directly from that primitive law, transcend ing convention, which forms the absolute basis of international law, and which, as founded on the nature of things, is neither validated by the consent of nations nor invalidated by their dissent, but under all conditions, at all times, is absolutely binding on them all in the forum of conscience at least. If the right of self-preservation could be exercised only by the consent of those against whom it is directed, it would be the bitterest of mockeries, instead of being what it is, a primordial and indestructible reality. International law, like municipal or constitutional law, is a rule of action, not the actions that it rules; those illustrate, but do not constitute it. The international code, a veteran diplomatist should not need to be reminded, is a body of principles, not a collection of all the cases that in the course of human events have come or may come under those principles.

The international sanction of the Monroe doctrine lies in the principle which the doctrine exemplifies. An independent nation, as we have already said, has the right to preserve itself and protect its vital interests by whatever means it may judge necessary or expedient; and, while this right is international, the means adopted to enforce it are not international but national. Whether or not in a particular case the means adopted are necessary or expedient, is a question. into which no other nation, and no combination of nations, has the right to inquire. It is not strictly a question of international law, but a question of politics, which the nation concerned is entitled to determine with supreme regard to its own security.

But what does it matter to the national security whether the measures by which it is menaced are peaceable or forcible? The warrant of resistance is the menace; and if that is serious, and of this under the law of nations the menaced nation is the judge, it justifies resistance to that which constitutes the menace, whether brought about by arms or diplomacy. To challenge force and bow to fraud or finesse, is not to assert the right of self-preservation or any other right; it is rather to abandon all rights, and lay down the national life at the feet of the aggressor. The acquisition of territory by intrigue is cheaper than conquest, and not so dangerous; and European powers, if previously assured of our acquiescence, we may be sure, would employ intrigue in lieu of force to extend their possessions in this hemisphere. Thus the Monroe doctrine, now the pride and boast of our people, would drop to the status of the Maine law, whose observers, if we may credit their satirists, content themselves with barring the front doors and blinding the street windows, while setting the side doors on the latch, and letting the gaslight stream into the alleys. It might not be difficult for the Monroe doctrine, in this sense, to receive the "general consent of nations." But what would it be worth? Where would be the national security which it proposed to guard? Where would be even the declaration against forcible intervention. of which exclusively the doctrine would then consist? The sole justification of such a truncated declaration is the right of selfpreservation, which justifies resistance to every agent of destruction or to none.

Besides, the Monroe doctrine is directed not against a process, but against a result, without regard to the process that produces it. "It is a condition, not a theory, that confronts us;" and the sum of the con dition is the extension of European jurisdiction in this hemisphere. It is this extension, by whatever means, which the Monroe doctrine regards as "dangerous to our peace and safety," and, consequently, declares our determination to resist. Not to dwell on the absurdity of resisting this menace to our security when effected forcibly, and acquiescing in it when effected peaceably, President MONROE's notification names expressly, and first of all, extension by colonization. the great historical example of peaceable extension. The Monroe doctrine, as formulated by MONROE, directly excludes the limitation which Mr. Cleveland imposes on it In fine, restricting the Monroe doctrine to forcible intervention is rejecting the terms of the doctrine as well as surrendering its principle, leaving it without a shred or hadow of justification. This restriction, it is almost needless to

say, runs counter to the whole current of public sentiment in this country on the Monroe doctrine since its first announcement. It flies in the face of the construction put on that doctrine by President Mox-ROE's immediate successor, who had been his Secretary of State, and by the galaxy of statesmen that surrounded him; and the note then sounded is the keynote of all the

day to this, exclusive of Mr. CLEVELAND'S, unfortunately. Less than three years after the declaration of the Monroe doctrine, President JOHN QUINCY ADAMS notified the world, in language guarded but well understood, that we could not assent to the transfer of Caba by Spala to another European State; and WEBSTER, in the Senate a few weeks later, vindicated this notification in one of the most celebrated of his speeches. from which we will quote:

"An honorable member from Kentucky [Mr. Wick-LIFFE argues that, although we might rightfully pre-vent another power from taking Cuba from Spain by force, yet if Spain should choose to make the volun tary transfer, we should have no right whatever to interfere. Sir, wis is a distinction without a difference. If we are likely to have contention about Cuba, let us first well consider what our rights are, and not commit ourselves. And, sir, if we have any right to interfere at all, it applies as well to the case of a peaceable as to that of a forcible transfer.

"Our right to interfere, sir, in any such case is bu the exercise of the right of reasonable and necessary self-defence. It is a high am delicate exercise of that right; one not to be made but on grounds of strong and manifest reason, justice, and necessity. question is whether the passession of Cubs by a great maritime power of Europe would seriously endang our own immediate s curity, or our essential inte ests. I put the question, sir, in the language of some of the best considered State papers of modern times. The general rule of international law is unquestionably against interference in the transactions of other States. There are, however, acknowledged exceptions, growing out of circumstances, and founded in those circumstances. These exceptions, it has been properly said, cannot, without danger, be reduced to previous rule and incorporated into the ordinar; diplomacy of nations. Nevertheless, they do exist, and must be judged of, when they arrive, with a just regard to our own essential interests, but in a spirit of strict justice and delicacy also toward foreign States. The ground of these exceptions is, as I have already stated, self-preservation."

Undeniably, this is the ground of the Monroe doctrine; but this ground, as we have seen, Mr. CLEVELAND outs clean from under the doctrine. By restricting the Monroe doctrine to forcible intervention, he unintentionally, no doubt, strips it of all reason, reducing it to a naked absurdity. Standing on this spreading branch of public law, Mr. CLEVELAND, emulating the simple woodman in the story chops off the branch between him and the tree from which it grows.

Should Congress formally declare the Monroe doctrine in this form, the declaration, as every statesman must perceive and every patriot feel, would be a national shame, and indeed a national calamity. It would be a blunder worse than a crime. Sir." said Mr. WEBSTER, discussing the Monroe doctrine in his well-remembered speech on the Panama mission in 1826; "I look on the message of December, 1823, as forming a bright page in our history. I will neither help to erase it or tear it out; nor shall it be, by any act of mine, blurred or blotted. It did honor to the sagacity of the Government, and I will not diminish that honor. It elevated the hopes and gratified the patriotism of the people. Over those hopes I will not bring a mildew; nor will I put that gratified patriotism to shame." So

say we all to-day! The Monroe doctrine we uphold is the Monroe doctrine that WERSTER upheld. It is not the Monroe doctrine of CLEVELAND, shorn and in eclipse. It is the Monroe docrine of MONROE, full-orbed and unobscured. But let no one imagine that we regard even the partial and imperfect enunciation of the Monroe doctrine by Mr. CLEVELAND on this occasion as anything else than one of the most wholesome and pregnant events in the history of the nineteenth century.

Queer, Isn't It?

Since England and Germany began to quarrel over the Transvaal question, England has given all her energy to the execution of military and naval projects, defensive and offensive, not only in Europe and Africa, but also in America. Her preparations for battle and war upon this side of he sea extend from Halifax to Vancouver, and in the outlying West Indies from Jamaica to St. Lucia. It is hard to believe that, in the event of

hostilities. Germany would send any part of her not overpowerful navy to attack Esquimault or Vancouver, in British Columbia, on the Pacific coast, in the immediate cicinity of the United States. Yet we had despatch from Vancouver in Saturday's SUN that gave us news in which all Americans must take an interest. It seems that there is the greatest activity on the part of the British naval authorities there; that the British Admiral in command there is sending an unusual number of telegraphic messages to the Admiralty Office in London: that the British fleet in the Pacific is to be enlarged from England, and that "the work on her Majesty's ship Satellite, now in the Esquimant dock, is being rushed both night

and day." There could hardly be greater activity in that part of the British dominions lying close to the borders of this country on the Pacific if the German Emperor had ordered a German squadron to begin the attack upon it at once. Can it be possible that Germany would think of fighting the ships and troops of England up there in the interest

of the Boers of the Transvaal? It is true that the British and American Governments are engaged in a debate over the Venezuelan question; but this Government has appointed a Commission to inquire into the merits of the British case against Venezuela; and there is some probability that the dispute will be peacefully settled. No matter that the London Times sald a few days ago that it would be more satisfactory for England to go to war at once over Venezuela than to take part in a sebeme for general arbitration between the United States and Great Britain. No matter for that. We are at peace with England. We have no quarrel with her at Esquimault or anywhere else on the Pacific coast of the American continent or on the Atlantic coast.

It is queer that the British Government should think it necessary to make military and naval preparations to meet Germany in British Columbia, for the sake of settling

the case of Dr. JIM. Again, it is hard to believe that in the event of hostilities between Germany and England, Germany would send either a naval squadron or an army to operate against the British strongholds in the West Indies, or, for example, at Nassau, which lies off the Florida coast, and which was a favorite resort for Confederate blockade runners during our civil war; or at Jamaica, or, all, at St. Lucia, which could hardly be captured by the whole power of the German navy. Yet, in the British West Indies, at Barbadoes and at St. Lucia, both of which islands lie but a short distance from the northern coast of Venezuela, and at sundry places in the Bermudas, not so very far from our own coast. England is strengthening her fleets and enlarging her garrisons as though she expected to fight Germany there. Looking at this conduct of England, with a military and naval eye, it is wholly incomprehensible.

It is true that the British and American Governments have a debate over the case of Venezuela: but the British are looking out for arrangements through which that deand the Monroe doctrine as defined by official utterances on the topic from that bate may be brought to a pleasant termina- sleeping little himself, while allowing his can't prove. Respectfully.

tion. No matter for the belligerent and impertinent language of foolish English ewspapers.

Again, up at Halifax, where Germany would hardly ever think of fighting for the Boers, England's preparations for trouble are almost as great as they are in those islands of the Lesser Antilles, which lie near to Venezuela. Why, if all the ships and troops of Germany, aided by the army of the Transvaal, were to strike for Halifax, we doubt whether they would ever be able to capture it.

Canada also, in addition to all these other places, is getting ready for defence against Bermany, apparently under the impression that WILLIAM II. will fall upon it as soon as war is declared. We are astonished that there should be such an impression. It may be thought that the Emperor's navy will sail through Hudson Strait and southward into Hudson Bay; but we must suppose he is aware that Fort Churchill is on one side of the bay, and that Cape Wolstenholme, on the other side of it, can easily be defended. Besides, the bay is frozen over nearly the whole of the year. Truly, we cannot see any reason why Canada should mave any fear of a German attack. We are aware that Canada takes an interest in the debate about Venezuela between the British and American Governments, but its people must surely know that an American Commission has been appointed to examine the grounds of the debate.

Looking at the whole matter calmly then, we would like to ask why it is that the British Government is making preparaion for hostilities at so many points upon the American continent and upon the outly ing islands that raise their heads not too far off from it?

We must suppose that, if hostilities were to break out between England and Germany, most of the fighting would take place in Europe and its waters, though perhaps there would also be some disturbance in Southern as well as Northern Africa. We cannot believe, and England can hardly believe, that Germany would rush at the British possessions upon the American continent or at those in the West Indies, lying near it.

Then, again, can it be possible that-England is really looking for war with this country over the case of Venezuela?

Delephones and Drubbles

If the inarticulate and hysterical, but certainly disinterested testimony of the Hon. EDWARD GROSSE may be accepted, the Hon E. J. H. DAMSEN attributes his numerous and diverting drubbles to "der delephones."

Those who know Damsen's method of not

conducting the business of the Sheriff's office, are aware that his official existence is made up of stretches of sleep, interspersed with occasional periods of wakefulness, the sleeping spells being the more numerous. In the penal institutions of England, the method of giving alarm for an escaped prisoner is by raising a black flag on a flagstaff at a conspicuous height. The appearance of this black flag gives notice to the inhabitants of the neighborhood that a convict is at large. Forthwith the efforts of the prison officials and of the local constabulary are directed to the recapture of the fugitive. So far as is known, no black flag is in use either in the Sheriff's office or in the east side branch of it officially known as Ludlow street jail, but more popularly as Damsen's Wayside Inn. The method adopted by his subordinates for giving the alarm in the case of an escaped prisoner-and prisoners, as is well known, escape from time to time from DAMSEN-is to ring, with much violence, the telephone; and this telltale appliance of ingenious electrical invention has been ringing in DAMSEN'S cars pretty steadily since the 1st of January, 1895, with no present indication that it will be ator, and as a person enjoying the esteem turned off until the Hon, LEVI PARSONS of the Ohio Republicans. MOUTON is heard from in his official capacity as Governor.

Damsen's "delephone" has rung out loud the riot in the jail. It rang again on the night that ARCHIBALD, in the cause of Reform, started to paint the town red. It rang recently, ushering in the new year, when one of Warden SHAD ROE'S prisoners became uproarious on the contents of a whiskey bottle pulled into the Ludlow street jail by a string. It has rung for all manner of cases, and its reverberating echoes resound continually in the first floor of the County Court House where the Sheriff is encamped. The persistent ringing of the telephone is distasteful to DAM-SEN, not merely because it is an indication of his own incompetency, but because it dis turbs his slumbers and completely disarranges his schedule of what, in a speech to the members of the Plattdeutsch Fest Verein, he is said to have described as "nabs.

In order to put an end to this objectionable and distressing ringing of the telephone, in cases of escape from his custody, allegations of overcharges by his auctioneers. errors in his service of jury notices, misfit appointments, complaints, errors, and blunders, a new rule, according to our contemporary the Herald, has been established by Damsen. He proposes to secure for him self, if possible, exemption alike from an noyance and from complaints. The account which the Hecald gives is as follows:

"During the last week one of the prisoners had occasion to telephone to his wife in New Bochelle. He used the telephone three times, and the charges recorded against him amounted to ninety cents, the paid the amount at the time to Warden Row, who made an accounting to the Sheriff. When the latter saw the item on the statement, he is said to have used violent language. The telephone privileges have been cut of from the prisoners by order of the Sheriff." Our neighbor, erroneously, as we are

bound to believe, attributes what it calls the violent language " of DAMSEN to his chagrin at being called upon to pay ninety cents out of his salary of \$20,000, paid him in monthly installments by the city. The Herald seems to incline to the belief that a constitutional question is involved in this matter; for it quotes an opinion of the United States District Attorney, to the effect that the denial of telephone privileges is a withholding of an inalienable right of all men arrested on accusation of crime or fraud. The real question at issue, we take it, is not the constitutional rights of prisoners, but the in allenable right of Damsen to get, unmolested by telephone calls and shouts of hello," his customary and essential amount of sleep each day. If he is to be deprived of his nap after breakfast and his siesta before lunch, of his Schlummer after lunch and before his coffee and cakes at 3 o'clock, of his sonnelling before and after dinner, and of his forty winks between the 9 o'clock and the 10 o'clock pretzels, beer, and Leberwurst, what will become of him? The law is not unreasonable in its exactions, and it does not demand impossibilities, even from reform Sheriffs. FRED-ERICK the Great, it is well known, brought fame and honor to the German fatherland by

enemies and antagonists to nod and doze as much as they pleased. Why should not DAMSEN, who has made Holstein officials forever ridiculous in New York, enjoy his nabs while he may, until the Governor removes him ?

The Worst of Losers. The report of the New York Yacht Club's Regatta Committee gives a satisfactory account of the Valkyrie-Defender races, infuding the foul. The Valkyrie would have been convicted if the committee had taken no other testimony than that of Lord DUN BAVEN and the laws of dynamics.

"After clearing the steamer," said Lord DUNRAVEN, meaning the Yorktown, which the committee places at about 600 yards from the starting line, "the Valkyrie held her course, then luffed, then kept away. The Defender after clearing the steamer held the same course as the Valkyric, then luffed, then kept hard away. So far each boat had executed the same manœuvres. In a picture printed in Leslie's Weekly, entitled "Thirty Seconds Before the Foul," the Valkyrie and Defender were shown as they were both luffing, the Defender being about 100 yards astern of the Valkyrie. Then they bore away for the ine, as Lord DUNRAVEN says. That would have brought the Defender 70 or 80 yards to leeward, and 40 or 50 yards astern, that is, on the Valkyrie's leeward quarter, about the most disadvantageous place for a boat to be. From that point Lord DUNRAVEN describes Valkyrie as holding on steadily for the line, and he says that the " Defender luffed again and fouled Valkyrie."

It is impossible for the DUNRAVEN account o be correct. If the Valkyrie had kept on er course as he describes her doing, it would have been beyond the power of the Defender to touch her at all. She could not have caught her. Some change of course on the Valkyrie's part was necessary to bring the boats together, and that happened in the "Valkyrie bearing down" as the general testimony has it, and fouling the Defender.

Then, again, if, instead of Valkyrie's luffing to clear the Defender, and swinging her boom around so as to eatch the Defender's shroud, the Defender luffed into the Valkyrie, how was it that the Defender hit the Valkyrie with her shroud, instead of with her bowsprit or forestay ?

Lord DUNGAVEN has flattered himself publicly on his ability to take a licking like a gentleman and a sportsman. By refusing to respect the Regatta Committee's decision in this case he took his licking by the De fender, as he did that by the Vigilant, like a cur. He whined.

John Sherman and His Colleague.

By a curious and not altogether pleasant arrangement of destiny. Ohio will be represented in the United States Senate after March 4, 1897, by the Hon. JOHN SHERMAN and the Hon. JOSEPH BENSON FORAKER JOHN SHERMAN is one of the most distinguished of Republican leaders. With a few exceptions, including one unpardonable crime against his country, his public career has been creditable to himself and honorable to his State. JOSEPH BENSON FORAKER IS also a well-known Republican, but his renown is of the sort oftener described as notoriety than as fame.

This strange comradeship is the sequel of a long story of political hostility, personal enmity, and intrigue to ruin, in which the two statesmen have been concerned, Mr. SHERMAN as the injured person and Mr. FORAKER as the plotter. It is not worth while now to recite the history of the onesided warfare. Much of FORAKER's energy and ingenuity has been devoted during the past six or seven years to the attempt to pull JOHN SHERMAN down, as a candidate for President, as a candidate for Sen-

Has Mr. Shekman vet forgotten or for given FORAKER's part in that extraordinary incident of the Ohio campaign of 1889, the and long after every escape, either from so-called ballot box forgery case! Has be Ludlow street iail or from the custody of forgotten the hypocritical professions of mso curfew on the night that AECHIBALD had | KER turned over the famous document which had been forged by his friend Wood to Field Marshal MURAT HALSTEAD, knowing that HALSTEAD would be sure to publish it, and knowing that the effect of the publication would be to ruin John Shen-MAN's reputation and at the same time kill off BEN BUTTERWORTH and WILLIAM McKINLEY, Jr. ?

Few men in public life have been cursed sistent enemies than JOHN SHERMAN has had in FORAKER. Now they are to sit side by side in the Senate, joint representatives of the great State of Ohio!

But there is nothing to prevent the large extension of Government bank accounts, during the period of strain, through deposit, against Governmen bond collateral, of a part of the \$105,000,000 legal tenders already in the Treasury .- New York Eccating

Nothing, except the want of authority in any officer of the Government to make such a deosit, and section 2,075 of the United States Revised Statutes, which provides that "all warrants drawn by the Secretary of the Treas ury upon the Treasurer of the United States shall specify the particular appropriation to which the same shall be charged."

It is possible that Lord Rosenegy, who is a good enough judge of poetry, is now scolding imself for neglecting to name a Poet Laureat during the period of his Premiership. Mr GLADSTONE, also, when Premier, had an oppor unity to save his country from the shame affected upon it by the choice of Austin. It is always dangerous to postpone the performance

Free wood has thrown away revenue of over \$8,000,000 per year. Checking Frain Praire. That settles it. Under an honest tariff for revenue only neither word nor anything else can be free. Everything must yield its just share of revenue.

How hadly England must feel over the reports that new gold nelds have been disin Colorado, Minnesota, Montana, Georgia, West Virginia, North Carolina, and everal other States. These mines are to be vorked for the profit not of England's chivatry out of blooming Americans. It is rough on the army of the left.

A Conclusive Brason. To the flaten of Tall as S. S. Why don't you take venithy Americans living in Europe t. Respectfully.

Recause you cannot tery special taxes on any particular class of citizens. Taxation must bear like upon all. The property of Americans living in Florope such pays its share of taxes.

Every Nation Most Build War Ships.

From the St. Lamor rights beginnerat.

Japan has endered the largest battle ship in the rid, and it will soon be launched in England. with he hald for with Calmese money, which illustrates the fact that a nation without war ships must build them for some other country.

A Man of Pence.

From the Buzel Green (Ky.) Herald. It's a lie-and its author is a liar. - Some one ha told that on Christmas eve I shot all around Leand Prooks's feet. Any one that anys that I shot round Lee Brooks's or any one cise's feet tells what they ROBERT MOTLEY.

JUSTICE TO THE BOERS.

Their Struggle to Maintain Independent

Against the Threats of Eagland, To the Editor of The Sun-Sir: Much hi been said in regard to the Transvaal question t engage the sympathies of the Americans for the Uitlanders, a so-called lot of harmless citizer

who are only asking for their civil rights. I was in the Transvaal in the years 1886-8 The Boer population was then between 40,00 and 50,000. I positively know that the Boer have not left their country, and every Boen family with few exceptions, has a large num

ber of children. In my capacity of Government official of the Fransynal republic I had a chance to know the Mairs of the country pretty well. I was alternately at Johannesburg, Barberton, Heidelberg,

Every one knows of the heroic struggle the

toers sustained in 1880 in order to regain their independence, of which they had been lawlessly

independence, of which they had been lawlessly despoiled by England in 1877. I know the whole cause and effect of this war from eyewit nesses, leaders in the war.

A price was set on the heads of Krüger and Bok, the then State Secretary.

England was fairly beaten, and would have had to make strenuous efforts and send renewed drafts from home in order to quell the war. The Boers themselves were threatened by a famine; it was for this reason that England was still able to dictate and retain the suzerainty in the treaty which rollowed, which treaty on that account was and is a most iniquitous thing.

Dearly have the Tranzvasiers bought their independence, and herolcally will they defend it. It is only within the last twelve years that gold has been found in the Transvasier to such a great, extent. I have heard prominent Boers say:

"The gold will be a curse to our country; it will bring in too many Englishmen and may cost us our independence."

Now Englishmen have come in by thousands, but on investigation you will find that not five ber cent, have the intention of making the country, their permanent home.

They all come to make their fortune, and when

per cent, have the intention of making the country their permanent home.

They all come to make their fortune, and when successful (often unsuccessful) return home or live in the British colonies of South Africa. The majority of Americans coming into that country almost invariably side with the English, as being a people speaking the same language and generally a sociable lot of follows. They do not know the Heer (Dutch) language; they have no means of knowing the worth of the Heers.

The republic being small, the Beer population small, and the country surrounded by England, every Englishman feels as though England ought to have it.

Nine years ago, when I was there, they

every Englishman feels as though England ought to have it.

Nine years ago, when I was there, they would observe their holidays, Queen's hirthday, &c., as they would in Englishmen you would find invariably that their discourse was full of insult to the President and Government of the country, where they came to make their fortunes, where they found just laws and an able tiovernment, only it did not allow itself to be swallowed up by them. What Englishmen could not get by force of arms they wanted to get by legislation, by becoming citizens and voters. Did they get the latter rights the Transvand republic would be wiped from the face of the earth, because the English element outnumbers the Boerish.

It was therefore that the Volksraad made a law of Paul Krüger's proposition, that no foreigner should become a citizen unless he had been in the country twenty years. It was the

eigner should become a citizen unless he had been in the country twenty years. It was the only means to preserve the Boer independences. When this law was passed, Paul Krüger said: "When the twenty years draw to a close we will make it thirty."

Bear in mind that the foreign population of the Transvaal is 90 per cent. English.

I trust this statement will serve in some small degree to lead the sympathy of the American people where it belongs, to uphold a small republic, with a hard-carned independence, against English greetiness.

Ticonderoga, N. V., Jan. 14.

From the Chicago Daily News,

A prominent member of the firm of Rothschild, upon entering one of bisclubs, was spoken to by a fellow member whose name he had for the moment forgotten. After a time the two proceeded to the billiard room to have a game together, and in order to give some interest to it they agreed to play for a shilling. For over half an hour the two played carefully, the advantage never being considerably in favor of either. However, if £1,000 had depended upon the result neutrer of them could have been more absorbed in the game than they were.

After it was over and the other player had left the room the member of the firm of Rothschild inquired the name of his antagonist. He had been playing with William K. Vanderbilt. The two men together were probably worth some \$250,000,000 of money, yet they had been struggling eagerly for the possession of one shilling.

From the Philadelphia Record. Take a bicycle, balance it with one hand, having one pedal at its highest point, the other sits lowest. To the lower one tie a string and pulit toward the rear of the machine.

Which way will the bicycle go?

Which way will the bleycle go?
It will go backward.
Most people think it will go forward, because the string tends to move the pedals in the direction they move when the machine is going forward.

McKinley a Man to Make the Country Pros

From an Interview with Ell Perkins McKinley is in the minds of the common people They know him. They have faith in him. His nomination would enthuse every workman in the land washes strongth among the working a and farms will yell with joy. Politicians may make other combinations, but McKinley is the man that the common people want. He will need no campaign. His name is sufficient. They know he will bring back the lost prosperity. The new Republican States, Ken-tusky, Missouti, Belawars, Maryland, and Tennesses would enthuse over McKinley. Wall street would feel safe, Lecause they know his policy would bring gold from England to settle the balance of trade which would then, with a higher tariff, be in our favor With his policy we borrowed \$3,000,000,000 to save the republic, and paid it back again to the people. He with more diabolically cunning and per- weatiget the revenue from champagne, laces, silks, velvets, kid gloves, Moquet carpets, wines, and Cuban eigars, consumed by the rich, and let ten, coffee, sugar,

Rated His Own Coffin from the Seed,

meat, and bread come free to the poor

From the Pittsburgh Disputch GREESSBURG, Ind., Jan. 12,-Judge Gren K. Parthin of Hartholomew county, who is now 8; years old, wa in his day a prominent lawyer and a Judge. He is wealthy and eccentric. Forly years ago he plants near his front doorstep a walnut with the avowed it tention of securing from the tree timber for his coffig The tree throve steadily. The other day, feeling strongly the infirmittee of ace, the Judge ordered the tree cut down and sawed into bourds. Then, by hi direction, the corpenter took his measure and begat

on saturday the Judge suffered a paralytic stroke and he is now enging the carpenter to make hasts. The physician says that the Judge cannot live longer

Early Candle Light State Dinners.

From the Chicago Record. It appears that in olden times, the President used & tve his dinner parties at 4 o'clock in the afternoon The grandfather of Representative Acheson of Pena-sylvania once dined with George Washington, and his family have preserved the invitation. It is written in a business hand on a fourth page of a sheet of clinary note paper, with the lines running length isomerous the sheet, and reads as follows: Mr. Acheeon is requested to dine with the Pres dent on Taursday, the 23d inst., at 4 o'clock precisel; "Fan. 14, 1797."

Outrages on Naturalized Armentane.

I rom the Troy Budget. The wife of Mark Agynllan, a naturalized Armentar residing in this city, is in Marash, Armenia, and b says is detained there against her will. Among thos killed were two uncles of Mrs. Agynlian, one of who was Peter Iskiyan, a naturalized Armenian. Pot brothers and two sons of Iskiyan reside in New York city now. Mrs. Agynilan writes that all her posses sions have been taken from her and that she is ! terrible destitution. Mr. Agyalian says he is going t try and have the United States Government get his wife out of that country at once.

Mr. Manhattan After all, the only State in the Union is New York. Miss Manhattan There's one other. Mr. M .- Indeed? What is it?

Mas M. - The state of unhappiness one must be in who do s not live in New York.

Freetive Branch Pribune. From the Letroid Tribune. Well, I should the critic. "Well, I should be critic."

Including the Poor in Flesh From the Letroit Tribune. The Glass Pater - Don't you think the living sketcton fake is getting profit odd?

The Four-logged Girl - Ah, but you know, the poor are niways with us.

A Misleading Report.

From the Detroit Tribune.

"I hear the Colonel is a hard drinker."

- Huh: He's the easiest drinker I ever saw in my
life."